

REMARKS:

In the Office Action mailed February 20, 2004, claims 7, 28, and 43 are objected to because of claim language informalities, claims 17, 18, 20, 21, 35-38, 50-53, 56, 59, 63 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112(2) as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention, claims 1-6, 10-13, 15-18, 20-27, 35-42, 50-55, 57-61, 63 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Kamada (USPN 6,381,637) (hereinafter "Kamada"), and claims 7-9, 28-34, 43-49, 56, 62 and 64 are rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamada in view of Liljeberg et al., "Optimizing World-Wide Web for Weakly Connected Mobile Workstations: An Indirect Approach", IEEE 1995 (hereinafter, "Liljeberg").

The foregoing claim objections have been amended according to the Examiner's recommendations and the claim rejections are respectfully traversed. Claims 1-13, 15-18, and 20-65 are pending and under consideration.

OBJECTION OF CLAIMS 7-9, 28-34, 43-49, 56, 62, AND 64 DUE TO CLAIM INFORMALITIES:

In the Office Action, on page 2, the Examiner objects to claims 7-9, 28-34, 43-49, 56, 62, and 64 because of claim language informalities. In particular, the Examiner objects to independent claims 7, 28, and 43, and recommends that the phrase "a link to the other data" should be amended to read "a link to other data" because the "other data" is not previously mentioned in the claim. Applicant has amended independent claims 7, 28, and 43 to overcome the objection. In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objection is overcome.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 17, 18, 20, 21, 35-38, 50-53, 56, 59, 63 and 65 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112(2):

In the Office Action, on page 3, the Examiner rejects claims 17, 18, 20, 21, 35-38, 50-53, 56, 59, 63 and 65 under 35 U.S.C. §112(2) as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 17, 35, and 50 have each been amended to recite, "the link information for the other data to be acquired .." As such, the limitation in each of claims 17, 35, and 50 is not indefinite because "the link information for the other data to be acquired" does not relate to either "first specific link information" or "second specific link information"

Each of claims 18, 20, 21, 36,-38, 51-53, 56, 59, 63, and 65 depend from independent claims 17, 35, and 50, and are respectfully traversed for at least the same reasons as discussed

for claims 17, 35, and 50.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-6, 10-13, 15-18, 20-27, 35-42, 50-55, 57-61, 63 and 65 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(a) AS ANTICIPATED BY KAMADA (USPN 6,381,637):

In the Office Action, on pages 3-15, the Examiner rejects claims 1-6, 10-13, 15-18, 20-27, 35-42, 50-55, 57-61, 63 and 65 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Kamada (USPN 6,381,637) (hereinafter "Kamada").

Referring to the reference relied upon by the Examiner, attention is directed to Kamada. Kamada relates to an apparatus having an Internet automatic Web page tracing function that shows hierarchically the relation between a home page (linking page) and pages of link destinations of the links in the home page (linked page). The Web tracing means comprises a history table in which a page access information history is stored each time control moves from a link source to a link destination. Kamada, column 4, lines 55-60. The apparatus stores the documents obtained from the internet in a memory, wherein the automatic Web tracing means perform automatic Web tracing with respect to the documents stored in the memory. Kamada, column 5, lines 5-15. The documents must be stored in the non-volatile storage means for use in off-line automatic Web tracing. Kamada, column 5, lines 30-35.

Regarding Independent Claims 1, 6 and 10, and Dependent Claims 2-5, 24-27, 39-42, 54, 55, 57:

Independent claim 1 of the present application recites: "...a storage unit comprising a table storing the location information acquired by the first information acquiring unit and the link information acquired by the second information acquiring unit in correspondence to each other; and a data acquiring unit acquiring the hypertext data from the location according to the location information and the other data indicated by the link information from the location information and the link information are stored in the storage unit."

In the present application, the data acquiring unit acquires hypertext data from the location according to the stored location information (linked side) and the other data indicated by the stored link information (linking side), wherein the stored location information and the other data indicated by the stored link information are stored in the storage unit. Thus, the device for displaying hypertext data acquires the stored location information and the other data indicated by the stored link information *prior* to acquiring the hypertext data, i.e., moving from a link source to a link destination.

Kamada does not disclose or suggest a data acquiring unit acquiring the hypertext data from a location according to the stored location information including the informing data designated by the designating unit and the other data indicated by the stored link information. Instead, Kamada discloses an automatic Web tracing device that stores link information, relating to a link source to a link destination, in a history table or automatic web tracing means *each time control moves* from a link source to a link destination. Kamada, column 4, lines 55-60. Further, Kamada discloses that the “documents must be stored in the non-volatile storage means” in order for the “hypertext data” and the “other data” to be acquired. Kamada, column 15, lines 26-35. Thus, the link information is only stored in the history table upon moving control from a link source (linking side) to a link destination (linked side).

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, independent claim 1 is distinguishable over Kamada.

Dependent claims 2-5 and 54 depend directly from claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Kamada, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-5 and 54 also distinguish over Kamada.

Similarly, independent claim 6 of the Applicant's claimed invention recites, “storing the acquired location information and the acquired link information of the hypertext data in correspondence to each other in a table; and acquiring the hypertext data from the location according to the stored location information and the other data indicated by the stored link information.” Therefore, for at least the reasons that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Kamada, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 3 also distinguishes over Kamada.

Dependent claims 24-27 and 55 depend directly from claim 6. Therefore, for at least the reasons that claim 6 patentably distinguishes over Kamada, it is respectfully submitted that claims 24-27 and 55 also distinguish over Kamada.

Similarly, independent claim 10 of the present application recites, “storing the acquired location information and the acquired link information of the hypertext data in correspondence to each other; and acquiring the hypertext data from a location according to the stored location information and the other data indicated by the stored link information.” Therefore, for at least the reasons that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Kamada, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 10 also distinguishes over Kamada.

Dependent claims 39-42 and 55 depend directly from claim 10. Therefore, for at least the reasons that claim 10 patentably distinguishes over Kamada, it is respectfully submitted that

claims 39-42 and 57 also distinguish over Kamada.

Regarding Independent Claims 11, 22, and 23, and Dependent Claims 12-13, 15-16, 31-34, 46-49, 58, and 60-61:

Independent claim 11 of the present application recites: "...a controlling unit acquiring the other data according to the designated link information when it is judged that the other data should be acquired, and storing the designated link information in designated information storage unit when it is judged that the other data should not be acquired."

As previously discussed, Kamada does not disclose or suggest a device having a storage unit to store designated link information when it is judged that the other data should not be acquired, that is, when the URL of HTML data designated is still on the Internet during an off-line state. Instead, Kamada discloses an *automatic Web* tracing device that stores link information for data selected to be acquired and displayed according to a link depth limit and other parameters specified by a user. Kamada, column 12, lines 25-47. Thus, Kamada does not disclose or suggest having the device store link information of data not to be acquired in a designated information storage unit so that the data may be acquired at a later time. More particularly, Kamada only discloses storing link information (relationship between a page and its link-source) in the link-source table (storage unit) each time the Web browser reads a new unread page. Kamada, column 14, lines 31-51, column 11, line 28 through column 13, line 56, and column 15, lines 14-17.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, independent claim 11 is distinguishable over Kamada.

Dependent claims 12-13, 15-16, and 58 depend directly from claim 11. Therefore, for at least the reasons that claim 11 patentably distinguishes over Kamada, it is respectfully submitted that claims 12-13, 15-16, and 58 also distinguish over Kamada.

Similarly, independent claim 22 of the present application recites, "... acquiring the other data according to the designated link information when it is judged that the other data should be acquired, and storing the designated link information in designated information storage when it is judged that the other data should not be acquired." Therefore, for at least the reasons that claim 11 patentably distinguishes over Kamada, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 22 also distinguishes over Kamada.

Dependent claims 31-34 and 60 depend directly from claim 22. Therefore, for at least the reasons that claim 22 patentably distinguishes over Kamada, it is respectfully submitted that

claims 31-34 and 60 also distinguish over Kamada.

Similarly, independent claim 23 of the present application recites, "...acquiring the other data according to the designated link information when it is judged that the other data should be acquired, and storing the designated link information in designated information storage when it is judged that the other data should not be acquired." Therefore, for at least the reasons that claim 22 patentably distinguishes over Kamada, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 23 also distinguishes over Kamada.

Dependent claims 46-49 and 61 depend directly from claim 23. Therefore, for at least the reasons that claim 23 patentably distinguishes over Kamada, it is respectfully submitted that claims 46-49 and 61 also distinguish over Kamada.

Regarding Independent Claims 17, 35, and 50, and Dependent Claims 18, 20-21, 36-38, 51-53, 59, 63, and 65:

Independent claim 17 of the present application recites: "... a judging unit judging whether the link information designated by the designating unit agree with the specific link information selected by the selecting unit; and a controlling unit ... storing the designated link information in a designated information storage unit when it is judged that the designated link information do not agree with the selected specific link information."

As previously discussed, Kamada does not disclose or suggest a device having a storage unit to store designated link information when it is judged that the other data should not be acquired, that is, when the URL of HTML data designated is still on the Internet during an off-line state. Instead, Kamada discloses an *automatic* Web tracing device that stores link information for data selected to be acquired and displayed according to a link depth limit and other parameters specified by a user. Kamada, column 12, lines 25-47. Thus, Kamada does not disclose or suggest having the device store link information of data not to be acquired in a designated information storage unit so that the data may be acquired at a later time. More particularly, Kamada only discloses storing link information (relationship between a page and its link-source) in the link-source table (storage unit) each time the Web browser reads a new unread page. Kamada, column 14, lines 31-51, column 11, line 28 through column 13, line 56, and column 15, lines 14-17.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, independent claim 17 is distinguishable over Kamada.

Dependent claims 18, 20-21 and 59 depend directly from claim 17. Therefore, for at

least the reasons that claim 17 patentably distinguishes over Kamada, it is respectfully submitted that claims 18, 20-21 and 59 also distinguish over Kamada.

Similarly, independent claims 35 and 50 of the present application each recite, "...judging whether the link information designated agree with the specific link information selected; and ... storing the designated link information when it is judged that the designated link information do not agree with the selected specific link information" Therefore, for at least the reasons that claim 17 patentably distinguishes over Kamada, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 35 and 50 also distinguish over Kamada.

Dependent claims 36-38 and 63 depend directly from claim 35, and dependent claims 51-53 and 65 depend directly from claim 50. Therefore, for at least the reasons that claims 35 and 50 patentably distinguish over Kamada, it is respectfully submitted that claims 36-38, 51-53, 63 and 65 also distinguish over Kamada.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 7-9, 28-34, 43-49, 56, 62, and 64 UNDER 35 USC §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER KAMADA (USPN 6,381,637), IN VIEW OF LILJEBERG ET AL ("OPTIMIZING WORLD-WIDE WEB FOR WEAKLY CONNECTED MOBILE WORKSTATIONS: AN INDIRECT APPROACH" IEEE 1995):

Claims 7-9, 28-34, 43-49, 56, 62, and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamada (USPN 6,381,637) (hereinafter "Kamada") in view of Liljeberg et al., "Optimizing World-Wide Web for Weakly Connected Mobile Workstations: An Indirect Approach", IEEE 1995 (hereinafter, "Liljeberg").

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Referring to the primary reference relied upon by Examiner, attention is directed to Kamada (USPN 6,381,637) (hereinafter "Kamada"). Kamada relates to an apparatus having an Internet automatic Web page tracing function that shows hierarchically the relation between a home page (linking page) and pages of link destinations of the links in the home page (linked page). The Web tracing means comprises a history table in which a page access information history is stored each time control moves from a link source to a link destination. Kamada, column 4, lines 55-60. The apparatus stores the documents obtained from the internet in a

memory, wherein the automatic Web tracing means perform automatic Web tracing with respect to the documents stored in the memory. Kamada, column 5, lines 5-15. The documents must be stored in the non-volatile storage means for use in off-line automatic Web tracing. Kamada, column 5, lines 30-35.

Turning now to the secondary reference relied upon by Examiner, attention is directed to Liljebert et al. Liljebert et al is directed towards improving data transfer in mobile communication technology by storing all incoming objects and associated in-line images into a local cache so that, if desired, the objects and associated in-line images can be requested at a later time. Additionally, the user can instruct the agent to store and receive a document into the cache as a background task.

Kamada, in view of Liljebert et al., is a mobile communication technology apparatus having an Internet automatic Web page tracing function that stores and retrieves linked documents from a cache index in order to improve data transfer.

In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness based on a combination of the content of various references, there must be some teaching, suggestion or motivation in the prior art to make the specific combination that was made by the applicant. *In re Dance*, 160 F.3d 1339, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 1998). The Examiner has not cited any teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the primary reference, Kamada, or the secondary reference, Liljebert, to make the specific combination.

Independent claim 7 of the present application recites, "... a second information acquiring unit acquiring the link information specified by the informing data designated by the designating unit, and a transmitting unit transmitting the location information acquired by the first information acquiring unit and the link information of the hypertext data acquired by the second information acquiring unit in correspondence with each other to a second information processing device ... a data acquiring unit acquiring the hypertext data from the location according to the received the location information and the other data indicated by the link information ..."

Thus, in the present application, the second information acquiring unit of the first information processing device acquires *location information* of the link information specified by the informing data designated by the designating unit and the *hypertext data* is acquired by the data acquiring unit in the second information processing device.

The primary reference Kamada does not teach or suggest acquiring location information to be transferred or not displayed on the Kamada display device. Kamada discloses acquiring

the link information specified by the informing data when the links are traced sequentially from Web page A to Web pages B and C which are hierarchically lower levels. Kamada, column 9, lines 40-50. As such, Kamada “teaches away” from acquiring link information that cannot be displayed to be transmitted and displayed using a second information processing device.

The proposed modification/combination of Kamada with Liljeberg also renders Kamada unsatisfactory for its intended purpose; therefore there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984), M.P.E.P. Section 2143.01. Kamada discloses acquiring link information specified by the informing data when the links are traced sequentially from Web page to Web page; however, the combination of Kamada with Liljeberg requires Kamada to acquire link information to be transmitted to a second information storage device without performing a link tracing function. Kamada, column 9, line 41 through column 10, line 15. Therefore, for at least the above reasons, independent claim 7 is distinguishable over Kamada, in view of Liljeberg.

Similarly, independent claims 28 and 43 of the Applicant’s claimed invention each recite, “... acquiring by the first information processing device the link information specified by the informing data designated by the designating; transmitting by the first information processing device the location information acquired and the link information of the hypertext data acquired ...” Therefore, for at least the above reasons, independent claim 28 and 43 are distinguishable over Kamada, in view of Liljeberg.

Dependent claims 8-9 and 56 depend from independent claim 7. Therefore, for at least the reasons that independent claim 7 patentably distinguishes over Kamada, in view of Liljeberg, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8-9 and 56 also patentably distinguish over Kamada, in view of Liljeberg.

Dependent claims 29-34 and 62 depend from independent claim 28. Therefore, for at least the reasons that independent claim 28 patentably distinguishes over Kamada, in view of Liljeberg, it is respectfully submitted that claims 29-34 and 62 also patentably distinguish over Kamada, in view of Liljeberg.

Dependent claims 44-49 and 64 depend from independent claim 43. Therefore, for at least the reasons that independent claim 43 patentably distinguishes over Kamada, in view of Liljeberg, it is respectfully submitted that claims 44-49 and 64 also patentably distinguish over Kamada, in view of Liljeberg.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 18, 2004

By: 

Gene M. Garner II
Registration No. 34,172

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501